DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 295 SP 025 573

AUTHOR Raywid, Mary Anne
TITLE Preparing Teachers for Schools of Choice.
SPONS AGENCY National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 4 Oct 84
NOTE 26p.; Seminar paper presented at a Hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (Austin, TX, October 4-5, 1984). For related documents, see SP 025 564-595.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Nontraditional Education; Parent School Relationship; Preservice Teacher Education; *School Choice; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

Schools of choice, established to respond to varying student and parent needs and interests, have unique features that require special teacher attributes. Programs preparing teachers for these schools include more emphasis upon: (1) content preparation, (2) the context of schools and classrooms; (3) the psychology of human growth and development; (4) a working knowledge of the psychology of learning; (5) an understanding of the sociology of youth; (6) an appreciation for the various socio-cultural backgrounds of students; (7) curriculum generation and management; (8) pedagogical methods and activities with emphasis on experiential learning; (9) both formative and summative evaluation; (10) orientation to the community; and (11) the development of a sense of community within the classroom and school. Field observation and field participation are emphasized, and solid practice teaching experiences are provided. In addition, numerous opportunities are given to the students to engage in collaborative efforts. The program itself serves as a model of a personalized, caring, and supportive community. (DG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

National Commission on Excellence
in Teacher Education
Hearings, Austin, Texas
October 4, 1984

Mary Anne Raywid
Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED250295

PREPARING TEACHERS FOR SCHOOLS OF CHOICE

Key Features of Schools of Choice

An informed and persuasive prescription for preparing teachers for schools of choice requires a description of such schools and a diagnosis of what is responsible for the successful ones. Thus, we must begin with a look at some of the salient features of schools of choice, and an account of what makes them successful.

Schools of choice, or options or alternatives, are of many types. In the public sector they have stood as a major mechanism for facilitating departure and permitting diversity -- and the particular departures they have represented reflect a broad band of educational orientation and practice. When one adds the private sector to the array of schools of possible choice, the variety and orientation spectrum is extended even further. Religious schools are included, of course, along with schools which depart more extensively from typical and standard practice than do most public school alternatives.

Schools of choice have been established in American education to respond to particular interests and concerns of students; the particular needs of some students; the orientation and preferences of groups of parents; and the educational ideas of particular groups of teachers. Accordingly, the programs have departed from local practice, and differed

SP 025 573

from one another, in various ways. Some depart from standard practice only with respect to one feature -- e.g., curriculum, or school climate, or religious orientation -- while remaining quite typical in other respects. Other schools of choice, however, depart from traditional practice across a broad front -- e.g., with respect to ethos, curriculum, instructional activities and environments, and school structure and management. There has tended to be a difference in scope and extent of departure in the schools within choice systems on the one hand, and the single alternatives established within more conventional school systems on the other. The sole alternative school within an otherwise fairly standard and traditional system is likely to depart further from typical practice than do each of the several schools co-existing within a school district that has placed its schools on an options basis. (This suggests the possibility that private schools might depart further from typical practice than do differentiated public schools. However, I know of no systematic evidence suggesting this to be the case. Perhaps market concerns serve to moderate departures.)

There are many different kinds of alternatives or schools of choice. Magnet schools are often designed to respond to particular interests, talents, or career aspirations. Individual alternatives have sometimes been targeted for particular groups -- such as able students in search of a more challenging and compelling education, or underachieving students in need of academic motivation and success. But often such schools are designed for a student cross-section who for a variety of reasons seek an educational program or environment different from that which is otherwise available.

The distinguishing features of schools of choice tend to differ at

different age/grade levels. At elementary levels, the focus is likely to be on particular pedagogical style and arrangements, as in open schools, Montessori schools, or traditionalist schools. At the secondary level, however, schools of choice vary across a wider range of dimensions. Instructional orientation might be a major focus but it is probably more likely to be either a particular curricular emphasis, or a particular sort of school climate.

There is increasing evidence of the effectiveness of schools of choice and of the unusual satisfaction rates of all concerned with them, students, teachers, parents, and the broader community. A number of factors have been advanced to explain the success and superiority of such programs. Not all of them succeed, of course. But those which do appear fairly consistently to exhibit a cluster of features that warrant attention.

First, the choice feature itself appears central. It is possible to diversify schools within a district but to continue assigning students and teachers to them. Some districts have undertaken this at least to some extent in dealing with particular youngsters. It is reflected in some tracking programs and in those referral programs established to meet the special needs attributed to particular groups of students. Such programs have often met with markedly less success than those in which both the teachers and students have chosen to be involved.

A second feature of schools of choice is that they are likely to be considerably smaller than traditional schools. Whether in separate buildings or structured as schools-within-schools, or mini-schools, they constitute far smaller operating units in administrative terms than we have grown accustomed to. Whether separately housed or not, these units

operate with their own set of students and teachers who remain distinct from other such groups for instructional purposes.

A third feature which seems to be associated with schools of choice is a great deal more autonomy and freedom from external mandates and prohibitions emanating from district, state, and federal agencies. So far as instructional matters are concerned, considerably more power resides in the school to shape the educational program.

A fourth attribute of schools of choice is that within the school, individual teachers exert greater control over their own practice than is typically the case in education. They experience a broader range of discretionary power and less restraint from others in exercising their own professional judgment.

A fifth associated attribute is that teachers in schools of choice are likely to experience their own practice as more professional in nature and more efficacious in its effects than other schools afford. They feel sufficiently free of imposed directives to be able to devise and implement strategies tailored to the needs of their students.

A sixth feature often associated with schools of choice is an unusual degree of collegiality. Teachers are likely to interact more, to depend on one another more, and to exchange professionally-related information and advice more openly and frequently than is typically the case in other schools.

A seventh feature of schools of choice is their cohesiveness. Such schools assemble a group of students, teachers, and parents who are related in some educationally significant way, be it philosophy or interests or other proclivities. Thus, as some have put it, such schools almost appear organizations in which students have taken out 'member-

ships,' and a strong sense of affiliation tends to emerge.

An eighth, related feature of schools of choice is that they typically offer far more personalized environments than do comprehensive high schools. This enables the entire school as a social system to operate far more on Gemeinschaft than Gesellschaft principles -- which affects communications structures, governance structures, and social control arrangements.

A ninth tendency is for schools of choice to adopt and actively pursue broader goals than conventional schools. They are typically concerned with a broader spectrum of knowledge acquisition, and with the sum of values, attitudes, orientations, and capacities of their students. They are rarely sheer academic institutions, then, or vocational. Most are actively concerned with the full character of the maturing individual.

A tenth feature is that staff in schools of choice tend to have far more extended and diffuse roles than is presently the case in other schools. Teachers are likely to feel responsible for, and to perform, functions elsewhere carried out by administrators and other specialized personnel. For example, they may deal with parents and other members of the public, help youngsters think through personal problems, and perhaps do maintenance or custodial chores. Administrators, in turn, may well teach and be involved in various ways in instructional and other activities. Extended roles appear the inevitable counterpart of smaller school size, where fewer support services are likely to exist.

An eleventh feature is that students, too, are likely to have more extended roles in schools of choice. In some they may teach, in others do peer tutoring or coaching, in others help with school maintenance

tasks, or in fund-raising. But they are responsible for more than knowledge acquisition and compliance, and they are likely to have more responsibility for themselves and their decisions. At least some evidence suggests that in public schools of choice, the greater the autonomy of the school, and the decision-making power of teachers, the larger the decision-making role of students.

A twelfth feature of schools of choice is that they are likely to manifest considerable self-consciousness about and concern with what is variously called climate, culture, moral order, or ethos. Whether the alternative be a fundamentalist or an open school, an elite private academy or an inner city ghetto school, there is likely to be a strong preoccupation with the ineffable matter of school spirit or 'soul.' There is frequent talk of what we are as a school and what we want to be, and there is frequent mention of such underlying principles as belief in and commitment to the success of all of the students enrolled.

Finally, a thirteenth attribute of schools of choice is that they tend to feature two kinds of instruction infrequently provided in other schools. These are independent study arrangements and experiential learning. Independent study is employed as a major means for individualizing instruction and it is used as a way of offering both more remedial and more advanced work than would otherwise be accessible, as well as for increasing responsiveness to particular student interests. Experiential learning of various types -- internships, activities, service projects -- are also prominently featured in academic, college preparatory schools of choice as well as in more career-oriented alternatives and magnets.

A number of other important attributes might be added -- such as the relative absence of disciplinary problems in schools of choice, and the

better attendance and retention patterns. But an effort has been made in listing the thirteen features cited to identify those which appear more generally matters of cause than of effect. Existing evidence tends to identify the features listed as the dynamics accounting for the beneficial effects of schools of choice. We are ready to turn, then, to the matter of what types of teachers such schools call for. After we have attended to that, we will be in a position to ask about the preparation necessary to generating these abilities.

The Special Teacher Attributes Needed

Teachers in schools of choice need to be both generalists and specialists to a degree which many teachers currently are not. They need to be generalists since such schools typically eschew the sharp divisions of labor which encourage secondary school teachers to concentrate solely on one discipline and perhaps only on a particular facet of that. By contrast, the themed curricula in some schools of choice -- e.g., the magnet schools with themes such as Aviation or Health Services or Sports or Humanities -- require teachers to draw content from several disciplines and realms of concern. Such programs also frequently put teachers in the position of devising their own curricula, and then devising ways to evaluate achievement related to it. So it is not only that they may deal with several disciplines; they deal with content in several ways, assuming what are otherwise in school experience several different roles in relation to content. Teachers in such schools are not in a position to remain merely the consumers of curricula and evaluation materials devised and distributed by others. This means that as educators, as well as in their role as subject matter experts, they must function more

broadly than is often expected (or permitted) in the conventional school.

But teachers in schools of choice also need to be specialists to a degree not typically demanded in the conventional school. The teacher in the magnet schools cited as illustrations above -- in Aviation or Health Services or Sports -- must know the theme area with a thoroughness not usually required of secondary school teachers who are more often charged, after all, with providing early introductions to the disciplines, not with advancing very far into them. By contrast, the teacher in the Aviation magnet must know the field, its technology and equipment, its occupational range and opportunities, its history and its prospects. Without such mastery the teacher is not in a position to respond to student interests nor to be able to fathom how to bring academic materials to bear upon them.

A major purpose of schools of choice is making formal education more responsive -- either to youngsters and their needs and interests, or to parents and their particular concerns. A serious effort at responsiveness must involve thorough comprehension of the traits to which one is responding. To be effective in instructional needs-meeting -- that is, in aiding the learning of young people who learn in quite different ways -- teachers need an understanding of what those ways are. To respond effectively for all, the teacher must understand and be able to identify the individual who learns primarily through audial modes and to distinguish such a youngster from another who needs kinesthetic modes for maximal learning. S/he needs an understanding of the different needs of the analytic and the wholistic learner, and to know how to respond to both. The effective teacher must also be aware of student differences with respect to social context needs -- and know how, then, to structure the

learning of one student so that it is independent and solitary, another so that it occurs in peer groups, and another so that it involves closer work with an adult.

The particular needs of learners is only one of the human dimensions, however, to which a responsive teacher must respond. Learner interests is another. Here, responding demands the kinds of content familiarity identified above -- with, e.g., sports or with aviation. But it is also in part a matter of understanding youngsters and their interests. We have long recognized that teachers need to understand human growth and development, but we have been much slower to see that they also need more than a passing awareness of student subculture and its specific content. To know what is on students' minds, and what their concerns are, is important to ascertaining necessary pedagogical starting points, and to maintaining motivation and interest. Teachers intending responsiveness need extensive familiarity with the subculture of their students.

Schools of choice are also sometimes designed explicitly to respond to the values of parents, as is often the case with traditionalist or fundamentalist or religious or prep schools. According to some observers, this is the primary dimension of the responsiveness of private schools, secular as well as religious. Especially in such cases, understanding of the orientation or ideology prompting the parental choice is of central importance to teachers. Whether for instance, the choice is a matter of a distinct ethnic cultural orientation or of a more general socio-economic class identification can prove of enormous importance to home-school relations and to the continuing support of parents.

There is at least one more set of characteristics that teachers need in order to be good prospects for schools of choice. This is a matter of

attitudes, beliefs, dispositions, of general orientation. Prospective secondary school teachers whose preparation is being influenced by today's so-called "Excellence Movement" are being taught that their function is to contribute to the academic and cognitive development of their students. Period. Indeed, they are learning that the taking on of broader functions and additional roles is what has ruined schools. To the extent that the preparation 'takes' -- and that it faithfully reflects the "Excellence Movement" -- these students are also modelling a demanding, no nonsense stance in response to present "get tough" policy. They have been advised in relation to motivation to look not to the carrot but to the stick. Or, to cast it in somewhat different terms, they have been equipped with the assumptions and prescriptions of McGregor's Theory X in human affairs, in preference to Theory Y.

Now if we want to think in terms of schools of choice, such an orientation will never do. If schools are to be places without captive audiences, then they've got to pursue rather different advice than that currently emanating from a number of sources in the name of excellence. Rather than assuming a get tough stance, they've got to transform themselves into institutions that are genuinely user friendly! For teachers, this means that a new commitment to responsiveness is essential. This is not to imply that students and their parents should dictate school practice. It does mean that listening to their desires and concerns is standard operating procedure, along with attempting an accommodation that can satisfy both the professional and the personal interests at stake. The teacher's obligation goes beyond performing in accord with what his/her subjectmatter and pedagogical expertise would recommend. There are multiple sets of interests to be accommodated and criteria to be met.

Somehow, teachers for schools of choice must acquire a disposition to respond effectively and successfully to every single one of the students comprising a teacher's day. This is quite a different professional charge from that which most teachers have internalized: the conventional stance, which the "Excellence Movement" strongly reinforces, is that the teacher's actions should be guided by what knowledge recommends. The obligation is to fulfilling the demands and expectations of professionally sound practice -- and one has fulfilled that obligation whether or not such practice proves offensive or unsuccessful in particular instances.

What teachers for schools of choice must learn is that the charge is different and the obligations are different. If the patient dies, the operation was not a success. Here, teaching must be much more of a people process and a negotiated process. It is not a matter of decision-making power or student enfranchisement. It is rather that teachers in schools of choice must be disposed to responding simultaneously to several sets of concerns: to professional knowledge and judgment to be sure -- but also to what is of conscious concern to youngsters and their parents. Obviously such teachers must have rather different aspirations and expectations of themselves than other teachers are guided to acquire. This seems mandated by the choice feature.

The Preparation Indicated

Schools of choice, then, require a better prepared teacher than many of us are graduating now. But as I hope the above strongly suggests, they also require teachers who have been quite differently prepared.

A prospective student teacher's experience might be a good place to

begin. She was seeking a placement in a Long Island school of choice and when she arrived for her interview, she was stunned to discover that one part of the screening was handled by a large group including a substantial number of students. The students were not making the decision about her, but they were participants in the screening and so had opportunity to put questions about what they judged important. Among the questions they asked -- with a candor and bluntness that traditional interviews would surely have finessed -- were the following: "What would you teach if you came here? What courses would you want to propose as your courses?" "Why should students take those courses? What have you to offer us?" "What would you do if nobody liked your class?" "How would you handle a kid who couldn't stay awake in class, because a fight at home had left him with no place to sleep the night before?" "What would you do with a girl who had planned to go to college but who's finding high school so deadly she doesn't think she can take another year of it?"

The questions were not so veiled or diplomatic, but what was asked was really quite pertinent to deciding whether a new teacher fits into a school and its ethos. The would-be student teacher decided she did not. I concurred with her judgment that she had not been prepared to deal with the challenges posed: She had received little help with how to design curriculum, and I suspect she wasn't fully clear herself on the logicial justification for the importance of her discipline -- or the importance of school and college, for that matter. Nor did she have a sufficiently detailed understanding of adolescents to be able to respond to hypothetical questions about how to motivate, help, and guide them. The required course work in Adolescent Psychology had yielded her some information, but she hadn't figured out how to apply what she knew and could only try

to draw on her own not-too-remote adolescent history.

This prospective student teacher's experience, plus what we have seen about schools of choice, recommend some important specifics for preparing teachers for such schools. Before considering these specifics, however, some introductory comments may be in order with respect to specialization within initial or pre-service teacher education. Certainly there should be some commonalities in the preparation of teachers for all kinds of schools and at all grade levels. In addition to knowing the content they will teach, all need to know something about the school as an institution, about learning, about human growth and development, about the nature of curriculum, and about how to teach data, concepts, and dispositions, as well as how to contribute to cognitive, personal, and social growth. While obviously there are differences in the way these categories ought to be filled in for, say, prospective elementary and prospective secondary teachers, there is good reason for retaining some commonality where possible. The preservation of commonality ought similarly to be a concern when we consider the instruction of <u>students</u> within schools of choice. An important operating principle of such schools ought to be that while offering some specialized features, none should circumscribe the chooser's future choices. So far as possible, the same principle ought to undergird the preparation of teachers for schools of choice: the initial decision to become a teacher in one kind of alternative should not close off a possible future choice to shift to another -- e.g., a decision to prepare for teaching in an open school should not yield such totally different preparation to preclude a later decision to shift to a social studies academy. (In the event that schools of choice and schools of assignment continue to co-exist, it might also be hoped

that the decision to prepare for teaching in a school of choice would not preclude a later decision to shift to a school of assignment. The remarkable satisfaction rates of teachers in schools of choice may, however, render such an option largely formal and academic.)

Clearly there are difficulties and challenges with such a keep-the-options-open principle. To the extent that schools of choice and assignment differ -- and that one type of alternative school differs from another -- it may prove difficult to pursue professional preparation that is sufficiently specialized while remaining general. The challenge ought to remain a consideration, however, and handled not as a dilemma forcing an elimination of one concern or the other, but as a set of tensions indicating two needs to be addressed. Actually, I suspect that the challenge in keeping the prospective teacher's choices open will not be so much a matter of differential knowledge needs as of differential worldviews and dispositions. The traditionalist teacher, for example, has quite a different picture of the world and set of attitudes toward it and its population than does the free school teacher. Since one's orientation and dispositions are a lot more durable and unchanging than one's store of knowledge, perhaps the choice shifts would not be so frequent, so mutually incompatible, or so problematic as to warrant extensive concern.

But turning now to the specialized features of the preparation of teachers for schools of choice. First, those interested in teaching in a themed option -- e.g., in a Maritime magnet -- need more content preparation than most baccalaureate programs yield. In the case of magnets whose themes coincide with disciplinary boundaries -- e.g., math and science or humanities schools -- the additional preparation might simply

be represented in more course work in the major field. But most magnet specializations do not coincide with the boundaries of academic disciplines -- a feature perhaps associated with their charm, for many — and that poses problems for teacher preparation. The preparation needs of a teacher who is to teach in a Health Services magnet are not met by a major in biology or physiology or social services or sociology -- although courses in all these areas could contribute substantially. What this suggests is that cross-disciplinary majors may best and most appropriately prepare teachers for such schools. They also need some sophistication about inter-disciplinary pursuits and their contrasts with more typical disciplinary inquiry and teaching.

Second, teachers in schools of choice need more work on the context of schools and classrooms than we commonly provide beginning teachers. We have earlier emphasized the extensive autonomy and decision-making responsibilities of teachers in schools of choice, relative to teachers in other schools. Decision-making places a premium on understanding, ruling out a preparation that would render teaching as a set of recipes or algorithms for routinized application. To understand is at least partially a matter of perceiving in broader context. To see something clearly and accurately is in part to see it in proper relation and connection to other things. Thus, prospective teachers for schools of choice need work on the context in which schools and classrooms operate. This requires work on the nature of schooling, the school's organization and function, our expectations of it, and the way it is judged. It also requires work on those dimensions of the society at large which impinge on and have particular significance for school policy and philosophy. This means exposure to selected aspects of the social, economic, politi-

cal, and philosophic context in which the school exists.

Third, teachers in schools of choice need work in the psychology of human growth and development. Broad goals are typical of such schools, which generally take an active interest in the personal and social as well as the academic development of students. Teachers need an understanding of the nature, pattern, and sequence of such development. It is important that they be in a position to accurately assess the kinds of responsibilities and opportunities youngsters are ready for.

Fourth, alternative school teachers need an extensive working knowledge of the psychology of learning. They particularly need preparation in human motivation, and this knowledge should be drawn from the sociology as well as the psychology of eliciting interest, commitment, and effort. But they also need a detailed working knowledge of diverse learning styles and strategies. Many generations of teachers appear to have been sorely misled by the generalizations about learning reported in educational psychology textbooks -- despite the repetitious allusions within those volumes to "individual differences." It is perhaps psychology as a social science which has contributed more than any other to the prevalent current assumption that there is a "one best way" of performing instructional as well as other teaching tasks, and that this one best way holds for all groups, or for youngsters "generally." But departures are not just a matter of "individual differences." A number of systematic differences among groups of students have been discovered -- e.g., wholistic and analytic learners; audial, visual, and kinesthetic learners; learners dependent on high structure and direction, and others dependent on low. Teachers intent on reaching all students need a working knowledge of such differences.

Fifth, teachers in schools of choice need a working knowledge of student culture. Each should have work in the sociology of youth -- a study which, to remain current, must change annually in content. It is to be hoped that initial preparation of this sort will equip prospective teachers both with the current specifics and with the skills and inclinations necessary to remaining up-to-date on such matters throughout one's teaching career.

Sixth, teachers in optional schools need work in the socio-cultural backgrounds of their students. Where the teacher's ethnic and socio-economic background matches those of the students s/he will be teaching, such work need not be extensive and a proficiency exam might well suffice in lieu of course work. Where the prospective teacher's background is different from that of students, however, such course work can be crucial. Some of the most poignant stories of teaching failures have resulted from just such knowledge gaps. The well-meaning middle class young people of the 60s who enraged poverty ghetto parents by trying to teach their youngsters macramé is a case in point. There have been many tragic instances where otherwise able teachers have ruined their own effectiveness by needlessly affronting ethnic or social class sensibilities without even being aware of it.

Seventh, prospective teachers for optional schools must have introductory work in curriculum. They need to understand what makes some content more important than other possibilities, and they need to know something of the nature and sources of knowledge. They must also learn how to create meaningful, sequential packages or assemblings of knowledge for their students, and they must know where to look for the knowledge that will illuminate their themes. For example, a teacher in a magnet school

or alternative where Environment is the theme must be aware of what disciplines will inform the study, and how to locate relevant content and materials from such areas as biology, zoology, botany, soil mechanics, animal husbandry, geology, ecology, political science, and economics.

Eighth, prospective teachers for schools of choice need better, more thorough preparation in the pedagogical methods and activities which comprise instruction. It follows from what has been said that the pedagogical challenge to such teachers is extremely demanding. The teacher cannot be content with designing and crafting the best way to convey given content: s/he must be prepared to devise different ways, as needed. Moreover, prospective alternative school teachers must be prepared to work in different ways with students, as well as with content: to work with individuals, and small groups, as well as with the full class group more typical of conventional instruction. Preparation must include exposure to innovative, motivating programs which have proved successful -- and such programs need to be scrutinized in ways that will equip teachers to design and devise their own, as needed.

There is at least one more crucial pedagogical methods component for teachers in optional schools. That pertains to experiential learning. As earlier noted, magnet schools as well as individual alternatives make learning from experience important. But sheer undergoing is no guarantee of learning, and although little noted, youngsters may need at least as much help on how to learn -- to extract meaning -- from experience as on how to learn from books and symbols. Prospective teachers must learn how to make such help available.

Ninth, teachers for schools of choice need special work in evaluation, both formative and summative. They need to understand the differ-

ences between what is quantifiably measured and that which can only be evaluated by qualitative methods. And they need work which will both sensitize them to the importance of ongoing evaluation, and enable them to select and devise adequate indicators of the progress they are trying to bring about. Since that progress is of wide scope, and since teachers in some schools of choice will be unable to use standardized tests with their curriculum, prospective teachers cannot be prepared simply as users or consumers of evaluative measures prepared elsewhere. They must learn the essentials of evaluation so as to be able to apply them as a part of their own planning.

Tenth, teachers in schools of choice are often involved with the community to an extent that other teachers are not. They need work in identifying resources, and in arriving at arrangements with e.g., civic agencies to accept and supervise interns, or a commercial firm to permit on site study or shadowing, or a government official to make a presentation, or a television studio to let a class spend an afternoon there. Equipping a prospective alternative school teacher to do this need not require extensive work, but it is important.

Finally, prospective teachers in schools of choice need to learn about school climate and its generation. More specifically, they need work on how to build cohesiveness, a sense of community, within the classroom and the school. Partly a matter of holding and conveying a set of attitudes about school, education, young people -- and partly a matter of learning particular instructional skills and activities -- this is a key ingredient in preparing teachers for alternative schools.

These seem to constitute the essential components or <u>elements</u> of teacher preparation for schools of choice. But several <u>qualities</u> must

also be cited. The first is preparing for the extensive collaboration which marks such schools. Since conventional schools typically do little to foster collaborative endeavor -- and a lot to discourage it -- candidates must learn peer cooperation as college students if they are to be able to work productively with fellow teachers in optional schools. Such learning is so largely a matter of pervasive dispositions and social skills that teaching a course in it would be ridiculous. But collaborative work must be a part of many courses if prospective teachers are going to learn how to do it. The teacher preparation program and most if not all of its courses should include repeated projects, assignments, activities, reports which involve cooperative endeavor -- and the process as well as the substance of these efforts must consistently receive attention.

Finally, a program preparing teachers for schools of choice must do everything possible to suffuse its own program with the attitudes and orientation it seeks to convey. It must be a user friendly program. Students within it must be made to feel that they matter to the institution, that they are respected, and that the program will empower them to become professionals. By virtue of its certifying function, no professional school ought to take the stance appropriate to earlier education levels that all should be brought to success. But it can nevertheless model a personalized, caring, and supportive community, each of whose members count. Since this particular recommendation is more amorphous than others, it is perhaps worth noting that it is not just a call for "TLC" in the teachers colleges. Rather, it is a suggestion that the social organization of such institutions be modified and that bureacratic norms and values be replaced with a different set.

A concluding note might be helpful on how these several elements and qualities can be assembled in a teacher preparation program. I think they could occur within the same time frame projected for other proposals -- preferably a five-year program which would culminate in a liberal arts baccalaureate and a masters degree in teaching. Desirably, however, the professional part of the program would extend over a several year period, ideally three years. A lot of the preparation I have called for is of a liberal arts nature -- e.g., the work on subjectmatter, on the context of schools, on human growth and development, on learning, on youth culture, on the socio-cultural attributes of ethnic groups. There is every reason to view such pursuits liberalizing and to consider them as much a part of general as of professional education for the prospective teacher. They will almost surely need, however, to be offered under the auspices of the teacher preparation program. The reason is not that they must be watered down, as critics might allege, but that they must be assembled in ways that disciplinary bounds and administrative structures will not permit in most institutions.

To cite just one example, I have recommended that both psychology and sociology need to inform the teacher's understanding of behavior and guiding of classroom events. But if the relevant knowledge is pursued in liberal arts courses, the prospective teacher is left to sift, borrow, lift, and assemble as needed -- a challenge too epistemologically intricate to leave to those least able to accomplish it. Yet the necessity of performing such an amalgamation was underscored again recently by Seymour Sarason, with his reminder that the whole course of American education in this century could have been different if Thorndike had only put two or three rats in his maze instead of just one. But he didn't. And thus,

for an understanding of group traits and group behavior, one must supplement psychology -- and help prospective teachers learn to judge when and how to draw on what.

If prospective teachers are to make important choices about the optional schools they prefer, an opportunity to observe schools must begin early. Perhaps ideally it might begin as soon as there is sufficient background to enable prospective teachers to look at high school classrooms from a different perspective than they viewed them as students. Surely this should begin to happen near or by the end of a first professional course. All subsequent courses should involve relevant observation and/or participation sequences. Students should select the particular school in which they are to student teach and should be helped to understand the ramifications of their choices -- i.e., the nature and assumptions and practices of that particular approach to education. Desirably, student teachers begin gradually, working with just one class -- and at this stage they are continuing simultaneously to work closely with college or university instructors on pedagogical methods. Thus, unlike the typical seminar arrangment that brings the student teacher back to campus infrequently (only once a week or less), faculty are in close touch with student teachers and helping them select and devise the classroom approaches and activities they will be carrying out. Such a scheduling arrangment not only provides tyros with much needed help; it also enables them to see and experience the connections between what they too often perceive as the two unconnectable worlds of "theory" and "practice."

Emphasis must be added about the importance of the practice teaching phase. It is here that the knowledge can be brought to bear and the

skills sharpened. It is also here that the socialization of the future teacher as teacher really begins. It follows from what we have said that this experience should come only near the end of the preparation program, when the prospective teacher is in a position to understand classrooms and their demands quite differently, and that the assignment should be to a school of choice selected by the prospective student teacher. Desirably, the candidate would have spent some time in the school prior to application. While it was suggested above that practice teachers begin slowly, perhaps initially with just a single class, it is also important that during the total experience they reach full exposure -- i.e., that they go through full teaching days which make demands comparable to those entailed by appointment as a teacher. It is also important that during the student teaching expereince they participate in some of the non-classroom activities of teachers within the school, particularly in collegial planning and other collaborative ventures.

I am convinced that if teachers were educated in the ways I have indicated -- e.g., if they were prepared explicitly to teach in schools of choice, in accord with what I have proposed -- we would have teachers who were far more effective, productive, professionally dedicated and satisfied than we are entitled to hope for now. Furthermore, we would have teachers in whom the inclination and wherewithal to keep on improving their own practice had been generated. For by preparing teachers for the collaboration and collegiality of schools of choice, we will have prepared them to go on learning. We will also have set in place what is our best mechanism so far for making schools self-renewing systems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berliner, David, ed. Research on Teaching: Implications for Practice. (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1982)

Blank, Rolf K. et al. Survey of Magnet Schools -- Final Report: Analyzing A Model for Quality Integrated Education. (Washington: James H. Lowry and Associates, 1983)

Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. (New York: Harper and Row, 1983)

Cuban, Larry. "Transforming the Frog Into a Prince: Effective Schools Research, Policy, and Practice at the District Level." Harvard Educational Review. (May, 1984)

Darling-Hammond, Linda. Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching. (Santa Monica: Rand, July 1984)

Darling-Hammond, Linda and Arthur E. Wise, "Beyond Standardization: State Standards and School Improvement," Elementary School Journal, January, 1985, forthcoming.

Erickson, Don. The British Columbia Story: Antecedents and Consequences of Aid to Private Schools. (Los Angeles: Institute for the Study of Private Schools, 1982)

Fantini, Mario. Public Schools of Choice. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973)

Fleming, Patricia; Blank, Rolf et al. Survey of Magnet Schools: Interim Report (Washington: James H. Lowry and Associates, September, 1982)

Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984)

Greeley, Andrew M. Catholic High Schools and Minority Students. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1982)

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence. The Child's Construction of Social Inequality. (New York: Academic Press, 1983)

Lipsitz, Joan. Successful Schools for Young Adolescents. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1983)

Lipsky, Michael. Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1980)

Mergendoller, John R. "To Facilitate Or Impede? The Impact of Selected Organizational Features of Secondary Schools on Adolescent Development," Adolescent Development and Secondary Schooling, Fred M. Newmann and Christine E. Sleeter, editors. (Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Unversity of Wisconsin, 1982)

National Education Association. Excellence in Our Schools: Teacher Education. (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1982)

Rand Corporation. A Study of Alternatives in American Education, Vol. VII: Conclusions and Policy Implications (Santa Monica: Rand, July, 1981)

Raywid, Mary Anne, Family Choice Arrangements in Public Schools: A Review of the Literature. (Washington: National Institute of Education, 1984)

Raywid, Mary Anne, "Synthesis of Research on Schools of Choice," Educational Leadership, April, 1984

Raywid, Mary Anne, The Current Status of Schools of Choice in Public Secondary Education. (Hempstead: Project on Alternatives in Education, Hofstra University, 1982)

Raywid, Mary Anne, Charles A. Tesconi, Jr., and Donald R. Warren, Pride and Promise: Schools of Excellence for All the People (Westbury, NY: American Educational Studies Association, 1984 forthcoming)

Royster, Eugene C. et al. An Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Magnet School Program. (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1979)

Rumberger, Russell W. Why Kids Drop Out of High School. (Stanford: Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Program Report No. 81-B4, 1981)

Rutter, Michael et al. Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979)

Sarason, Seymour. "A Radical Idea in the Service of a Conservative Goal," paper presented at "Excellence in Our Schools: Making It Happen," A National Forum on Educational Reform, San Francisco, March 14, 1984

Sizer, Theodore R. Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984)

Slavin, Robert E. Cooperative Learning. (New York: Longman, 1983)

Smith, David C., ed. Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators. (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983)

Tyack, David and Elisabeth Hansot. Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980. (New York: Basic Books, 1982)

Warren, Donald R., "Second Thinking in Teacher Education," Teacher Education Quarterly. (Spring, 1984)

Zumwalt, Karen Kepler, "Research on Teaching: Policy Implications for Teacher Education," Policy Making in Education. Ann Lieberman and Milbrey W. McLaughlin, eds. Eighty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982)